

Application No. 10/707,308  
Docket No. 138007  
Amendment dated May 4, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of February 4, 2005

### REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-18 of the above-identified US Patent Application, with the result that claims 1-4 and 13-18 were rejected under either 35 USC §102 or 35 USC §103 as being anticipated or unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,524,019 to Takenouchi et al. (Takenouchi), and claims 5-12 (which depend from claim 1) were deemed to recite allowable subject matter. In response, Applicants have amended the specification and claims as set forth above. More particularly:

The specification has been amended to insert the serial number of the related U.S. patent application originally identified by its attorney docket number on page 1 of the specification.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to specify that the first rotor region is limited to being formed of a martensitic stainless steel, a Fe-Ni alloy, or a nickel-base alloy if the second rotor region is formed of a NiCrMoV low alloy steel - in other words, the monolithic rotor is limited to one of the following combinations of first and second rotor regions: (a) the second rotor region formed of a NiCrMoV low alloy steel and the first rotor region formed of a martensitic stainless steel containing about 11 to about 14 weight percent chromium, or an Fe-Ni alloy, or a nickel-base alloy; or (b) the second rotor region formed of a martensitic stainless steel containing about 11 to about 14

Application No. 10/707,308  
Docket No. 138007  
Amendment dated May 4, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of February 4, 2005

weight percent chromium and the first rotor region formed of a CrMoV low alloy steel, a martensitic stainless steel containing about 11 to about 14 weight percent chromium, an Fe-Ni alloy, or a nickel-base alloy.

Dependent claim 4 has been canceled as being inconsistent with its amended parent claim 1.

New independent claim 19 is based on claim 1 but limits the composition of the second rotor region to a NiCrMoV low alloy steel and excludes CrMoV low alloy steels from the list of possible compositions for the first rotor region, consistent with amended claim 1.

New independent claim 20 is also based on claim 1 but limits the composition of the second rotor region to a martensitic stainless steel containing about 11 to about 14 weight percent chromium.

Applicants believe that the above amendments do not present new matter. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of remaining claims 1-3 and 5-20 are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### **Prior Art Rejections**

As noted above, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-4 and 13-18 were rejected under 35 USC §102 or 103 in view of Takenouchi,


Application No. 10/707,308  
Docket No. 138007  
Amendment dated May 4, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of February 4, 2005

while dependent claims 5-12 were deemed to recite allowable subject matter on the basis of reciting "different metal compositions" from Takenouchi. As noted above, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to limit its scope to those alloy combinations recited in claims 5-12. Applicants believe that the amendments to claims 1 are consistent with the subject matter identified by the Examiner as being patentable over the prior art of record, and therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC §§102 and 103.

### Closing

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that their patent application be given favorable reconsideration. Should the Examiner have any questions with respect to any matter now of record, Applicants' representative may be reached at (219) 462-4999.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Domenica N.S. Hartman  
Reg. No. 32,701

May 4, 2005  
Hartman & Hartman, P.C.  
Valparaiso, Indiana 46383  
TEL.: (219) 462-4999  
FAX: (219) 464-1166